

means over 340,000 workers across the country, and several thousand workers in my state of New Mexico, will be without support needed to maintain their lives and re-train for the future. These are real people and real lives we are talking about, and we simply can't let this happen. We must act now to ensure the programs continue.

Let me briefly explain what this legislation is about. In 1962, when the Trade Expansion Act was under consideration, the Kennedy Administration came up with a very straightforward proposition concerning international trade and American workers and companies: if and when Americans lose their jobs as a result of trade agreements entered into by the U.S. government, then the U.S. government should assist these Americans in finding new employment. If you lose a job because of U.S. trade policy, you should have some help from the federal government in re-training to get a job.

I find this a reasonable and fair proposition. It suggests that the U.S. government supports a open trading system, but recognizes that it is responsible to repair the negative impacts this policy has on its citizens. It suggests that the U.S. government believes that an open trading system provides long-term advantages for the United States and its people, but that the short-term costs must be addressed if the policy is to continue and the United States is to remain competitive. It suggests that there is a collective interest that must be pursued, but that individual interests must be protected for the greater good.

This commitment to American workers and companies has continued over the years, and should not be ended now. The reason for continuity is obvious: globalization is only moving at a faster pace, with the potential for ever more significant impacts on our country. In my opinion, the process of globalization is inevitable. It is not going to stop. Therefore, the question for us in this chamber is not whether we can stop it, but how we can manage it to benefit the national interest of the United States.

The picture we see of globalization is that of a double-edged sword, with some individuals and companies gaining and others losing. The gains are clear-cut. Exports now generate over one-third of all economic growth in the United States. Export jobs pay ten to fifteen percent more than the average wage. Depending upon who you listen to, it has generated anywhere from two to eleven million jobs over the last ten years. For those who dislike globalization, I say look in your kitchen, your living room, your driveway, your office, and see the products that are there as a result of a more open and interdependent trading system. Without expanded trade brought on as a result of globalization we will end up fighting over an ever-decreasing domestic economic pie.

But in spite of these obvious benefits we cannot ignore the problems in-

volved with globalization. Every day we hear disturbing stories about what this has meant for people across the country. In my state we have seen over the last year a large number of lay-offs and closings in small rural towns that cannot afford to have this happen. The closing of three plants in Roswell, Las Cruces, and Albuquerque meant 1,600 people lost their jobs. Next came lay-offs in the copper mines in my home town of Silver City. These people cannot simply go across the street and look for new work. They are people who have been dedicated to their companies and have played by the rules over the years. What they deserve when they lose their job is an opportunity to get income support and re-training to rebuild their lives. What they deserve is a program that creates skills that are needed, that moves them into new jobs faster, that provides opportunities for the future, that keeps families and communities intact.

TAA offers the potential for this outcome. Although in need of revision in several key areas—and I am focusing on these areas at this time—it has over the years consistently helped individuals and companies in communities across the United States deal with the transitions that are an inevitable part of a changing international economic system. It helps people that can work and want to work to continue to work in productive jobs that contribute to the economic welfare of our country. We have made this promise to workers in every administration, both Democrat and Republican, and we should continue to do so. Although TAA is not without its flaws, it remains the only program that allows workers and companies to adjust and remain competitive. Without it, in my opinion we are saying unequivocally that we don't care what happens to you, that we bear no responsibility for the position that you are in, that you are on your own.

Senators ROTH, MOYNIHAN, and others think otherwise, and I agree wholeheartedly with them. I believe that this commitment to individuals and companies and communities must be kept. I urge all my colleagues to support the passage of this bill when it comes to a vote on the floor.

#### THE F-15 AND ISRAEL

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the F-15, the world's dominant air superiority fighter. The future of this fighter, perhaps the most successful in the history of U.S. aviation warfare, is in jeopardy. While both the Senate and the House have taken steps to save the F-15, the Administration has resisted efforts to preserve a plan that is critical for our national security.

I was heartened by the recent action of the House Appropriations Committee to follow the Senate's lead and provide additional funding for the F-15. Last month, Senator BOND and I successfully added an amendment to the

Defense Appropriations bill to provide \$220 million for four F-15s. Last week, the House Appropriations Committee provided \$440 million to purchase eight F-15 fighters.

While securing domestic dollars is essential to keep the F-15 alive, foreign sales are just as important for the long-term health of the program. Hence, my disappointment that the Israeli Government had selected the F-16 to fill their latest Air Force needs goes without saying. As Angelo Codevilla writes today in the *Wall Street Journal*—and I will ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks—the F-15 gives Israel critical long-range strike capability to counter regional threats. As one who is keenly interested in the security of Israel, it was my hope that the new Barak Government would select the F-15 to enhance its long-range deterrent capability.

Mr. Codevilla also implies that the Administration was pushing Israel to buy the F-16, a less capable plane that would not defend Israel as well—particularly against the threat posed by missiles from Iran, Iraq, and Syria. While Israel must make its own decisions with regard to its security, I sincerely hope the Administration was not pushing our ally to purchase a less capable plane just so that Syria or Iran would not be offended. Lasting peace in the Middle East will be based on a sustainable settlement that can be defended through strength, not by pushing Israel to take steps which limit its ability to defend itself.

Mr. President, sustaining the F-15 is essential for U.S. airpower as we enter the 21st century. Preserving the F-15 is also essential to my home state of Missouri. The 7,000 Missourians who build the F-15 are a national security asset. Both houses of Congress have sent clear signals to the Administration that this plane should be saved. It is time for the President to start listening and take steps immediately to ensure funding for the F-15 is included in the defense budget.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Wall Street Journal*, July 19, 1999]  
CLINTON'S DREAMS OF PEACE IGNORE MIDEAST REALITIES

(By Angelo M. Codevilla)

What exactly does President Clinton expect from Israel's new prime minister, Ehud Barak? At a joint news conference last week, Mr. Clinton declared that he wants Mr. Barak "to widen the circle of peace to include Syria and Lebanon and to revitalize talks among Israel and the Arab world and to solve regional problems." Mr. Barak spoke more cautiously, declaring his commitment to "change and renewal" but also his uneasiness at Americans who have acted "as a kind of policeman, judge and arbitrator at the same time."

Mr. Barak may be indebted to Mr. Clinton for undermining his predecessor, but he also

is a serious military man. Israeli officials are sure to spend the aftermath of Mr. Barak's visit sorting out the vast differences between the assumptions of the Clinton game plan and Israel's military realities.

The military threat to Israel used to consist of the massed armies of its immediate neighbors. But today's most ominous threat is weapons of mass destruction carried by missiles from Iraq, Iran, Syria and perhaps Libya. Israel's foes believe they could break Israeli military power in the opening minutes of a war by launching ballistic missile strikes with chemical or biological weapons against mobilization centers and weapons-storage areas. These countries have made an enormous investment in new missiles, most stored in deep tunnels, highly fortified bunkers or mobile launchers.

Gen. Eitan Ben Eliahu of the Israeli Air Force has estimated that Syria alone already has some 1,000 ballistic missiles, and that within a few years most will have long ranges. Syria does not need long-range missiles to hit Israel, but with longer ranges, each missile fired from Syria would develop enough re-entry speed to negate Israel's budding antimissile system, the Arrow. Already Iran's Shahib 3 missiles—developed with Russian, Chinese and North Korean help—stress the Arrow; the forthcoming Shahib 4's will overwhelm it.

To keep up with the increasing capability of enemy missiles, Israel's Arrow needs to be connected to the projected U.S. space-based fire-control system. But the Clinton administration doesn't want this system for the U.S., much less for Israel, for fear of violating the 1973 U.S.-Soviet Antiballistic Missile Treaty. To handle the overwhelming number of enemy missiles, Israel would need a U.S. orbital antimissile device. But the administration has delayed tests of a space-based laser that had been set for 2001. So Mr. Barak won't get any missile defense out of Mr. Clinton.

The Israeli Air Force has some pretty sophisticated plans for the nearly impossible job of striking enemy missiles before they are launched. But these plans require lots of deep-strike F-15 I aircraft. Israel has only 25; it has been negotiating for 15 more. Washington would rather see Israel buy more F-16's, which can't help Israel with its missile problem. The F-16's are less threatening to Syria, which the administration sees as the key to peace.

Instead of military help, the Clinton administration will give Mr. Barak generous instructions in its own conception of peace in the Middle East. Yet Mr. Barak will be compelled to note that Mr. Clinton's view of the world clashes with the one that Israel has been developing for some time, regardless of its dealings with the Palestinians.

Following the traditional maxim that foreign policy proceeds from the nature of the regime, Israel has sought alliances with Turkey and Jordan, because their regimes are stable, and because their friendship is secured in part by their enmity with Syria. Israel has talked about cooperation on missile defense with both Ankara and Amman, which see themselves as part of the West against Russian-supported forces in the region. Another main reason why Turkey and Jordan are interested in the alliance is Israel's deep-strike capability against Iran and Iraq.

Israel has been wary of Egypt, and even more of Saudi Arabia, because although the governments in these countries U.S. allies, instability would vitiate any deal with them. As for Syria, much as Israel would like a deal with it, its enmity is mitigated only by its instability.

The Clinton administration is trying to transcend traditional alliances. In the Wil-

sonian tradition, it seeks a settlement including all and directed against none. It believes that the path to peace includes exchanging military advantages for goodwill, "guaranteed" by some sort of international contact group. Thus the Clinton administration would bless the only deal Syria would accept—Israel's surrender of the Golan Heights—and call it peace.

Some Israelis would be happy with this, because it would carry the implicit assurance that the U.S. would assume responsibility for Israel's borders. It should be crystal clear, however, that Washington has neither the interest nor the capacity to hold Syria to any deal, much less to fight for Israel.

Here then is the choice Mr. Barak must mull on his way home: He can trust the Clinton team and move his country toward a deal with its enemies that violates normal rules of military prudence. Or he can seek the military means of being useful to his Turkish and Jordanian friends while being fearsome to states that are enemies of America and Israel alike.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

## REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH LIBYA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 48

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of December 30, 1998, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c).

1. On December 30, 1998, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, virtually all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the

Government of Libya in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked.

2. On April 28, 1999, I announced that the United States will exempt commercial sales of agricultural commodities and products, medicine, and medical equipment from future unilateral sanctions regimes. In addition, my Administration will extend this policy to existing sanctions programs by modifying licensing policies for currently embargoed countries to permit case-by-case review of specific proposals for commercial sales of these items. Certain restrictions apply.

The Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) of the Department of the Treasury is currently drafting amendments to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the Regulations), to implement this initiative. The amended Regulations will provide for the licensing of sales of agricultural commodities and products, medicine, and medical supplies to non-governmental entities in Libya or to government procurement agencies and parastatals not affiliated with the coercive organs of that country. The amended Regulations will also provide for the licensing of all transactions necessary and incident to licensed sales transactions, such as insurance and shipping arrangements. Financing for the licensed sales transactions will be permitted in the manner described in the amended Regulations.

3. During the reporting period, OFAC reviewed numerous applications for licenses to authorize transactions under the Regulations. Consistent with OFAC's ongoing scrutiny of banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (20) involved types of financial transactions that are consistent with U.S. policy. Most of these licenses authorized personal remittances not involving Libya between persons who are not blocked parties to flow through Libyan banks located outside Libya. Three licenses were issued authorizing certain travel-related transactions. One license was issued to a U.S. firm to allow it to protect its intellectual property rights in Libya; another authorized receipt of payment for legal services; and a third authorized payments for telecommunications services. A total of 26 licenses were issued during the reporting period.

4. During the current 6-month period, OFAC continued to emphasize to the international banking community in the United States the importance of identifying and blocking payments made by or on behalf of Libya. The office worked closely with the banks to assure the effectiveness of interdiction software systems used to identify such payments. During the reporting period, 87 transactions potentially involving Libya, totaling nearly \$3.4 million, were interdicted.